EXHIBIT N

HAJIM SCHOOL OF ENGINEERING & APPLIED SCIENCES
UNIVERSITY of ROCHESTER

RANGA P. DIAS
ASSISTANT PROFESSOR
HOPEMAN ENGINEERING BUILDING, Room 220
P.O. BOX 270132
ROCHESTER, NEWYORK 14627

TEL : (585) 276-4112
FAX : (585) 256-2509
Email: *rdias@rochester.edu*

October 28, 2023

Via Email: stephen_dewhurst@urmc.rochester.edu
Prof. Stephen Dewhurst
Vice President for Research
Vice Dean for Research, School of Medicine & Dentistry
University of Rochester
Cell: (585) 797 7840

Re: Investigation

Dear Professor Dewhurst,

I am writing in response to your email dated October 25, 2023to provide clarity regarding our recent communications and the events surrounding the committee's investigation.

In response to your email dated October 25, 2023, I wish to reiterate the circumstances that led to my unavailability during the specified dates for the committee meeting. As you are aware, my absence during that period was solely due to the imminent birth of my child and the medical condition of my wife, which required my immediate attention and support. I have expressed my willingness to cooperate fully after the resolution of these personal matters. I have consistently made myself available for any questions, whether written or verbal, and I have diligently complied with all requests for information, granting access to my emails, computers, equipment, and experimental data.

I would also like to address the issue of essential information. As you know, you, working on behalf of the committee, have procured access to all my U of R emails, all of my U of R computers, all of my U of R equipment, all of my existing experimental data and I have fully cooperated with you and the committee in support of such access. Additionally, as I understand it, you, on behalf of the committee, have been working with my former students and various co-authors of various papers who have apparently provided you with access to their files and data related to the experimental work that is the subject of those papers. I have not been provided with any details regarding the data obtained from my former students, co-authors, or the editors at Nature. Despite my willingness to engage with the committee and answer any questions, I have not received any written inquiries or clarifications from the committee's end.

Additionally, I understand that you, on behalf of the committee, were working with the editors of Nature requesting a retraction of the most recent paper. I understand that in working with the editors at Nature, you and the committee have access to all the pre-publication and post-publication information available from the editors at Nature. I have not been provided with any information from the committee related to the information available from the editors at Nature.

With respect to your assertion that I declined to be interviewed by the committee in August of this year, I respectfully disagree with your accusation. Again, the committee selected limited and specific dates during a week that I previously arranged to be in Chicago to conduct experiments with Professor Hemley's group. Unfortunately, the committee was unwilling to accommodate my schedule and provided no alternative dates for an interview upon my return from Chicago. Instead, the committee again selected very specific dates during which my wife and I were expecting our child. The committee has offered no alternative dates but has now refused to conduct any further interview of me or provide me with any written questions before they conclude their "investigation".

I now want to respectfully address your defense of the composition of the committee and the concerns that I have raised for some time now about the biased and prejudicial composition of the committee that you have selected. I must again express my concerns regarding the composition of the committee. During our previous interactions, I perceived a lack of impartiality, and I felt unfairly targeted. The committee's composition, particularly the relationships between its members and their affiliations, raises questions about objectivity and independence, as outlined in the NSF's referral letter. I have raised these concerns previously, and my direct communication with the NSF was a result of the apparent conflicts of interest that were not acknowledged. This conclusion is supported by the roles that you and legal counsel, both working on behalf of the committee, have played in working in the "background" with various students and the editors of Nature. Despite my initial optimism that this process would be fair as described in the NSF referral letter, I have never been made to feel that you were at all interested in allowing me to respond in a neutral, unbiased and non-prejudicial environment to any accusations levied by disgruntled former students.

Additionally, I would like to bring to your attention a concern regarding the qualifications of Dr. Marus Millot, the current chair of the committee. Regrettably, Dr. Millot lacks the essential credentials and experience required to effectively lead this committee. Both Dr. Millot and I embarked on our Ph.D. journeys simultaneously (2006-2007) and successfully completed our doctoral studies within a similar timeframe (2010 and 2013, respectively). Despite our comparable academic backgrounds, there exist significant disparities in our fundamental scientific perspectives.

One noteworthy point of contention revolves around Dr. Millot's prominent research on Superionic Water Ice, a topic on which I have expressed my disagreement. In my professional opinion, this claim is not supported by the evidence provided. Moreover, I find the recent act of granting access to my emails deeply concerning. This intrusion into my privacy, particularly in the context of the ongoing scientific disagreements involving Dr. Millot, constitutes a blatant violation within the academic sphere.

Considering these issues, I firmly assert that the entire proceedings have been compromised. Consequently, I urgently request a complete restart of the process. It is imperative that the reinitiated proceedings ensure the formation of an unbiased and impartial committee. I emphasize the need to expedite this restart without further delays to maintain the integrity of the academic inquiry at hand.

I am fully committed to cooperating with an impartial and unbiased committee, offering complete assistance to facilitate the investigation. If the committee believes it has not obtained all the necessary information from my emails, computers, data files, former students, their files, or the editors of Nature, kindly furnish me with a list of the additional information required and the

reasons for its necessity in the ongoing investigation. I am more than willing to provide any further assistance deemed necessary by the committee.

I recognize the importance of your fair and balanced attention to these matters, and I sincerely appreciate your understanding in this regard. Thank you for your thoughtful consideration of this issue.

Sincerely,

Ranga P. Dias

cc: Renato Perucchio
Chair, Department of Mechanical Engineering
Professor, Department of Mechanical Engineering
Professor, Department of Biomedical Engineering
Program Director, Archaeology, Technology, and Historical Structures
236 and 415 Hopeman
Rochester, NY 14627
Via Email: ***rlp@me.rochester.edu***